**Amendments to the Drawings**

Figures 5-7 have been amended to correct informalities. Replacement sheets for said figures are being submitted herewith. No new matter has been added.

## REMARKS

The Examiner's continued attention to the present application is noted with appreciation. Formal replacement drawings for Figs. 5-7 are being submitted herewith.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowance of claims 8-10, 18-20, and 29-36, and the allowance of claims 5, 15, and 23-28 if rewritten in independent form. Regarding the remainder of the pending claims, for convenience, Applicant reprints the remarks filed with the response of October 17, 2005.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by the Cyber-Journal of Sport Marketing reference. The Examiner also rejected claims 2-4, 6, 13-14, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Cyber-Journal of Sport Marketing reference in view of Waechter et al. The rejections are respectfully traversed, particularly as to the claims as amended. All of the claims as amended require that after the subjects are shown a video presentation, they are asked if they recognize any of a plurality of still images obtained from the video presentation. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion in paragraph 4 of the Office Action, none of the art cited by the Examiner discloses showing the subjects a plurality of still images obtained from a video presentation. Page 3 of the Cyber-Journal reference, under "Methodology", states: "Immediately after the viewing, subjects were asked to identify game sponsors *from a list of actual advertisers and sponsors.*" (Emphasis added.) The subjects were not shown still images from the video, but rather shown a list of advertisers and sponsors. Although the disclosed video presentation contains "imbedded sponsor mentions", only a list of sponsors, *not still images*, is subsequently shown to the subjects according to the cited reference. Even if the "imbedded sponsor mentions" were subsequently shown to the subjects (which hypothetical method is *not* disclosed in the reference), this would not be the same as showing the subjects still images obtained from the video. Thus, according to MPEP §2131, the Cyber-Journal reference does not anticipate: "'A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.' *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." Further, since all the claim limitations are not taught or suggested by the prior art, *prima facie* obviousness has not been established per MPEP § 2143.03.

In a telephone conference on February 10, 2006 with the undersigned agent, the Examiner indicated that all of the pending claims are allowable. Applicant notes that this paper is being filed on March 13, 2006, which is the first business day after March 11, 2006, and thus within two months of the date of the referenced Final Office Action. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the issuance of a Notice of Allowance, or alternatively an Advisory Action allowing the present application per MPEP Section 706.07(f)(D)(1). If any issues remain the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned agent for Applicant at the telephone number listed below. Authorization is given to charge payment of any fees required to Deposit Acct. 13-4213.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

Philip D. Askenazy, Reg. No. 56,721
Direct line: (505) 998-6132

PEACOCK, MYERS & ADAMS, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)
P.O. Box 26927
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87125-6927

Telephone: (505) 998-1500
Facsimile: (505) 243-2542

**Customer No. 005179**

G:\AMDS\Young\201 Request for Reconsideration.doc